

Such a resolution fit well with the aspirations of Harris and other members of the TCA who sought to refocus the society around a subject matter rather than a technique.¹⁸ The TCA made a proposal to the NIH Study Section for Cell Biology to fund a committee to “improve working relations among cell biologists.” The Study Section for Cell Biology, the primary vehicle in NIH for providing grants for research, was established in 1958 as a result of splitting what had been the Study Section for Morphology and Genetics into two sections, one for genetics and the other for cell biology (Copeland, 1999).¹⁹ The Study Section unanimously approved the proposal and agreed to fund a meeting of up to ten cell biologists to consider how to promote this end. Harris was appointed chair of this committee, and he, in turn, selected Keith Porter

media for tissue culture at reasonable cost and to publish a bibliographic index of tissue culture methods (first published in 1952 under the title *Index of Tissue Culture*). It also ran a number of summer courses in Cooperstown, New York. Keith Porter was selected as chairman of the committee charged to establish the commission. In 1949 the name was changed to Tissue Culture Association (TCA) and George Gey was elected its first president. The TCA held annual meetings, often in conjunction with the American Association of Anatomists (see Copeland, 1999).

¹⁸ In 1959 Morgan Harris, as President of the Tissue Culture Association, sent a Bulletin to members advancing the idea, developed by John Paul, Don Fawcett, and W. F. Scherer, of reorganizing the TCA to focus on cell biology. He first noted that since tissue culture had come to be “a standard part of the experimental armamentarium,” the need to promote tissue culture as a technique had declined. He then put forward the idea of focusing on a subject matter and identified cell biology as comprising a central interest of the membership. Specifically, he proposed that “an appropriate reorganization of the present TCA might result in a timely and useful society of cell biologists – cytologists, physiologists, biochemists, morphogeneticists, etc.– including those not now in the field of tissue culture but whose interests concern the cell.” At the business meeting of the TCA in Atlantic City in April, 1959, forty-seven members voted to explore such reorganization but eleven were opposed, apparently some of them quite vociferously. After the initial meeting to form the ASCB, however, the TCA elected to remain independent of it and “let nature take its course.” In 1994 the society changed its name to the Society for In Vitro Biology.

¹⁹ One of the Study Section’s first initiatives was a proposal for University Laboratories for Cell Biology. The report approved by the study section on 27 September 1958 identified the first draft as having been “prepared by an *ad hoc* group including Dr. Keith Porter, Chairman, Dr. Clifford Grobstein, Dr. Heinz Herrmann, Dr. Daniel Mazia, Dr. Ernst Scharer, Dr. Van Potter and Dr. Herbert Taylor.” Their idea for these laboratories was partly modeled on the various national institutes comprising the NIH, but was explicitly to be decentralized to “college campuses, where the scientific staff would be in contact with students.” This proposal was not well received by the NIH administration and the Study Section instead proposed to support long term funding of highly qualified groups of individuals in a manner less restricted than individual grants. The proposal was that the NIH would maintain such a program for at least twenty-five years. A version of this plan was implemented and some grants were given, including one to the University of California, Berkeley, for a group involving Daniel Mazia, Morgan Harris, Max Alfert, and others (Interview with Morgan Harris, 9 December 1995, University of California, Berkeley).